The
PERVIGILIVM
VENERIS

The

PERVIGILIVM

VENERIS

*

Vidal

REFERENCE LIBRARY * HOUGHTON MIFFLIN CO. * BOSTON, MASS.
Archive
Collection
This book may not leave the Offices
and if borrowed must be returned within 7 days

PERVIGILIVM VENERIS

This edition is limited to 260 *copies for the United States of America,* 250 *of which are for sale.*
This is number 251

R W Postgate

PERVIGILIVM VENERIS

incerti auctoris
carmen de vere

THE EVE OF VENUS

In Latin and in English
Edited and translated with
a Commentary by
R. W. Postgate

BOSTON AND NEW YORK
HOUGHTON MIFFLIN COMPANY
1924

PREFACE

PREFACE

I

THE *Peruigilium Veneris*, or *Eve of Venus*, is a short spring song, written for the eve of a festival of Venus, in this poem mostly called Dione. It is a poem of growth, of love and of marriage, and it was written some time during the long decline of Roman literature. And that is all that is known about it.

No one knows when the song was written, nor by whom. It has been ascribed to Catullus, to Seneca, and to Thomas Seneca Camers, a Renaissance writer. With less absurdity, it has been ascribed to Florus, who wrote in the reign of Hadrian, or to Tiberianus, who wrote in the reign of Constantine. Its author is in fact unknown, though the anonymous Leipsig edition with calm impudence describes this most lovely poem as "certainly by a half-educated man in a degenerate age." So far as probabilities go, it is probable that it was written either in the age of Florus or that of Tiberianus: it is certainly not of the "golden age" of Latin poetry, and it is not modern. It has all the mystery of the unknown: it comes to us as it were unsigned and from where we do not know.

This we do know: it is a poem as strange as it is beautiful. It is neither of the ancient nor of the modern world, but lies between, mingling some of the beauties of both. It is far away from the ancient classical verse, in its almost primitive use of the repetition of words, in its almost sensuous delight in vowel sounds and the accumulation, in the simplest rhythmic manner, of descriptive phrases:

facta Cypridis de cruore, deque amoris osculis
deque gemmis, deque flammis, deque solis purpuris.

Sometimes it reminds us not of the Romans, of Catullus

or Vergil at all, but of the most modern and most florid poets, Swinburne or Elroy Flecker. But neither is it of the medieval Latin which was driving out the classical. "There is in it," wrote Walter Pater, "along with the last splendour of the classical language, a touch almost prophetic of that transformed life it was to have in the rhyming middle age just about to dawn." True enough. But there is an infinite and fortunate distance between the *Peruigilium* and the Latin Hymn.

Noctis aura quem relinquit spargit umentis aquas.
emicant lacrimae trementes de caduco pondere;
gutta praeceps orbe paruo sustinet casus suos.
en, pudorem florulentae prodiderunt purpurae:
umor ille, quem serenis astra rorant noctibus,

and so on, was what the author of the *Peruigilium* wrote. Here, quoted by Johannes Wowerius (the name is not invented) is what the hymn-writer made of it:

ubi guttas florulentae
mane rorat purpurae
umor algens cum serenis
astra sudant noctibus.

Apart from the taste of the verbal alterations, the change in rhythm is enough. The crude and simple dingdong metre has brought us to another age.

The trochaic metre in which the *Peruigilium* is written perhaps tells us something. It was one of the oldest Roman metres, and was used by Ennius and Pacuuius. Submerged by the "classical" metres imported from Greece, it remained popular as a half-accentual metre for singing or shouting. Aurelian's victorious soldiers sang him in to the same metre:

Mille, mille, mille, mille, mille decollauimus:
unus homo mille, mille, mille, decollauerat;
mille, mille uiuat annos ille qui mille occidit:
tantum uini habet nemo quantum fudit sanguinis.

Less vaingloriously, Caesar himself had earlier entered Rome in triumph to the tune of his soldiers' song:

urbani seruate uxores, moechum caluum adducimus.

The *Peruigilium* is obviously, from its content, not a song to be shouted or sung on the march by a crowd. But it is probably based on some such popular chorus, and its famous refrain—*CRAS amet qui nunquam amauit quique amauit cras amet*—is a shout in itself. It may well be true that this line was a popular refrain used—who knows?—at some spring festival, in Pisa or elsewhere, of Isis or Venus.

But with that, all, and perhaps more than all, has been said that can usefully be said as an introduction to this poem.

II

But a few remarks may be permitted upon the translation. No prose translation, obviously, can correctly represent a verse original. Nevertheless, a prose translation here at least is better than a verse translation. The path is strewn with warnings, and many better scholars than myself have come to grief. The cadences of the *Peruigilium* make it nearly impossible to represent in English verse. I have never seen (though I have studied all that I could lay my hands upon) a verse translation that attempted to reproduce, for example, the change, in colour and texture, that comes at the end of the poem. The alteration from joy to sorrow is as simple as it is poignant. To me

illa cantat, nos tacemus: quando uer uenit meum?

is one of the most affecting lines in classical verse: for it is a lament, not for the death of a loved woman or friend, but for the death of a whole nation and a whole civilisation. It comes just after a passage on the new life of spring. Yet our English verse translations have failed before they even reached the point of considering such questions.

The great and original trap is the refrain. How shall one render *cras amet qui nunquam amauit quique amauit cras amet?* A single sentence—one which must not be bald, but must suggest the singing original. Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch attempts to retain the loud shout of the opening *cras* by rendering: "Now learn ye to love who loved never —now ye who have loved, love again." But *cras* does not mean "now." Dr. Way, in pursuit of the same end, writes: "Tomorn who ne'er hath loved shall love, and who hath loved shall love tomorn." *Tomorn!* Dr. Warren wrote:—"Knowest thou love? Tomorrow mind him! Know'st him not? Tomorrow find him!" rendering one sentence by four, a refrain by a complicated series of question and answer, and introducing an unwanted "thou." Thomas Stanley, who translated the poem in 1649, wrote:

"Love he tomorrow, who loved never;
Tomorrow, who hath loved, persever."

But apart from the unpleasing accent "perséver," what on earth has the idea of *perseverance* to do with the poem? In face of what difficulties?

Perhaps if some examples of verse translations are given, those will be the best defence of a prose one. Mr. Cecil Clementi, who varies the refrain in each section (an indefensible proceeding) writes for lines 76 to 80:

"Fields obey the touch of Venus, fecund with voluptuous joy;
Aye, amid the fields ('tis rumoured) Love was born, Dione's boy:
Him, begotten on the glebeland, Venus fondled at her breast,
Fostered him with dainty kisses that on roses' lips he pressed.
Know'st thou not love's joy and sorrow? Thine be love's caress tomorrow."

Readers of the *Peruigilium* owe a great debt to Mr. Clementi, but not for writing phrases like *fecund with voluptuous joy*. Almoſt inoffensive becomes Parnell's :

"In rural seats the soul of pleasure reigns ;
The love of Beauty fills the rural scenes ;
Ev'n Love (if fame the truth of Love declare)
Drew firſt the breathings of a rural air,
Some pleasing meadow pregnant Beauty preſt,
She laid her infant on its bowery breaſt ;
From nature's sweets he supp'd the fragrant dew,
He smiled, he kissed them and by kissing grew.
Let those love now who never loved before,
And those who always loved, now love the more."

One may like or abominate that particular trick of writing verse, now out of fashion. But no one can say it is in the leaſt like the original. Avoiding artificiality, the translator turns to writing pure prose, as Mr. L. H. Grundy (lines 63 to 68) :

"She herself Creation's Sovereign
By a secret force within
Regulates both mind and matter
With her all-pervading soul
And through earth and through the heavens
Through the underlying seas
Hath in all the realms of Nature
Fused her own enkindling life,
Fused—and to the world the secret
Taught whereby men may be born.
Ye who've never loved, now love ye !
Ye who've loved, now love the more ! "

Or else he falls into a floridity equally alien to the original. Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch in the same passage (beginning with line 62) writes :—

"As the terrible *thighs drew it down*, and conceived, *as the embryo ran*,

Thoro' blood, thoro' brain, and *the Mother gave all to the making of man*,
She, she, *our Dione*, directed the seminal current *to creep*,
Penetrating, possessing, *by devious paths*, all the height, all the deep.
She, of all procreation *procuress*, *the share to the furrow laid true*;
She, *she*, *to the womb drave* the knowledge, and opened the *ecstasy* through:
Now learn ye to love who loved never—*now* ye who have loved, love anew!"

I have italicised the words and phrases, which seem to me to import an idea not to be found in the original. Mr. John Clark:

"She it is that veins and instinct kindles with pervasive breath,
Stealthily floods the caves of being with the sap that mastereth:
Thorough air and thorough dry-land, thorough the subjacent sea
Scatters she her heat prophetic, by the path of venery,
Ordering nature to discover how 'twas fated to be born.
Love to-morrow shall the loveless, lovers love to-morrow morn."

Examples might be multiplied: here are enough.

As for my own translation of the refrain, I ought perhaps to say that I am aware *amet* does not mean "will love," but that I have availed myself of a similar license to that taken by some of the translators above. My defense is that "let him love" and such phrases are grammarians' English, or rather, not now English at all.

III

Nobody has the right to put out an edition of any author, or indeed to make any statement, without letting the reader

or listener know where he can check the accuracy of what is put before him. I have therefore included in this edition a full list of variant readings, and a discussion of certain difficulties, and these will be found in their proper places. Here I only wish to remark two things. Firstly, as suits one who is not professionally a classical scholar, I have been somewhat conservative and have made no considerable changes on my own judgment. The intention of this book is not materially to advance classical scholarship, but to provide a reasonably probable, and entirely readable text and translation of a poem for readers who will appreciate the *Peruigilium* for its beauty more than its traps for scholars. Perhaps some of these will miss a line—the last but one—to which they have been accustomed; if so, they may read my defence in the note to that passage; but apart from that I have tried to prevent textual questions obtruding themselves. Secondly, I have not rearranged the poem in a strophic manner, nor on a quatrain basis, nor even written any verses of my own and inserted them. I have studied no less than seventeen rearrangements of the poem, and they were all different. It appears incontestable that sixteen at least are wrong, and I strongly suspect that seventeen are. If the poem had a systematic structure, it has not been discovered, and I have no desire to add an eighteenth scheme. The *Peruigilium* has been the subject of violent handling by its editors, and even, in the case of the younger Janus Dousa, of obscene practical joking. It is hoped of this edition only that it provides a reasonable text that will not offend the ordinary intelligent reader.

I am much indebted to my father, Prof. J. P. Postgate, who has read through the edition in MS. and made many valuable suggestions. I am also much indebted to the careful edition of Mr. Clementi.

TEXT AND TRANSLATION

INCIPIT
PERVIGILIVM VENERIS
TROCHAICHO METRO

cras amet qui nunquam amauit, quique amauit cras amet.
uer nouum, uer iam canorum : uere natus orbis est,
uere concordant amores, uere nubunt alites,
et nemus comam resoluit de maritis imbribus.
cras amorum copulatrix, inter umbras arborum,
inplicat casas uirentes de flagello myrteo,
cras Dione iura dicit fulta sublimi throno.
cras amet qui nunquam amauit quique amauit cras amet.
tunc cruore de superno spumeo pontus globo,
caerulas inter cateruas, inter et bipedes equos,
fecit undantem Dionen de maritis imbribus.
cras amet qui nunquam amauit quique amauit cras amet.
ipsa gemmis purpurantem pingit annum floridis,
ipsa surgentes papillas de Fauoni spiritu
urget in nodos tepentes, ipsa roris lucidi
noctis aura quem relinquit spargit umentis aquas.
emicant lacrimae trementes de caduco pondere :
gutta praeceps orbe paruo sustinet casus suos.
en, pudorem florulentae prodiderunt purpurae :
umor ille, quem serenis astra rorant noctibus,
mane uirgineas papillas soluit umenti peplo.
ipsa iussit mane totae uirgines nubant rosae :
facta Cypridis de cruore, deque amoris osculis,
deque gemmis, deque flammis, deque solis purpuris,
cras ruborem, qui latebat ueste tectus ignea,
unico Noto marita non pudebit soluere.
cras amet qui nunquam amauit, quique amauit cras amet.
ipsa nymphas diua luco iussit ire myrteo.
it puer comes puellis : nec tamen credi potest
esse amorem feriatum, si sagittas uexerit.
ite, nymphae ; posuit arma, feriatus est amor :
iussus est inermis ire, nudus ire iussus est,

THE EVE OF VENUS TRANSLATED

To-morrow love comes to the loveless, to-morrow lovers love again.

Spring now is fresh and full of singing; in spring the world was born, in spring loves join hearts, in spring the birds mate and the wood loosens her hair for her husband rain. To-morrow among the trees' shadows the Queen of loves weaves her bowers, plaited green with myrtle shoots: to-morrow Dione reigns from high upon her throne.

To-morrow love comes to the loveless, to-morrow lovers love again.

On that day Ocean, from blood from heaven, with a ball of sea-foam, mingling both, among green multitudes and his two-foot horses, made Dione, the daughter of the waves.

To-morrow love comes to the loveless, to-morrow lovers love again.

She herself embroiders the crimsoning year with flower-jewels, herself with the west-wind's breath swells the growing breasts into warm flowers, herself scatters the drops of shining dew left by the air of night: they shine out like tears, quivering with their falling weight; each drop on the verge of falling holds back its tiny bead. See, the crimson flowers have betrayed their blush: the dew that the stars drop in the clear night frees at dawn their virgin breasts from their dripping garments. She herself has ordered that at dawn all virgin roses shall marry: made of Venus' blood, of the kisses of love, of jewels, of flame, and of the crimsons of the sun, to-morrow unashamed the rose will unfold to her only husband, the south wind, the crimson hidden in its bridal veil.

To-morrow love comes to the loveless, to-morrow lovers love again.

She, the goddess, has sent her nymphs into her myrtle

neu quid arcu, neu sagitta, neu quid igne laederet.
sed tamen, nymphae, cauete, quod cupido pulcher est :
totus est in armis idem quando nudus est amor.
cras amet qui nunquam amauit, quique amauit cras amet.
conpari Venus pudore mittit ad te uirgines :
una res est quam rogamus : cede, uirgo Delia,
ut nemus sit incruentum de ferinis stragibus,
et recentibus uirentes ducat umbras floribus.
ipsa uellet te rogare, si pudicam flecteret,
ipsa uellet ut uenires, si deceret uirginem ;
iam tribus choros uideres feriatis noctibus
congreges inter cateruas ire per saltus tuos,
floreas inter coronas, myrteas inter casas,
nec Ceres, nec Bacchus absunt, nec poetarum deus ;
de tenente tota nox est peruiglanda canticis ;
regnet in siluis Dione : tu recede, Delia.
cras amet qui nunquam amauit, quique amauit cras amet.
iussit Hyblaeis tribunal stare diua floribus :
praeses ipsa iura dicet, adsidebunt Gratiae.
Hybla, totos funde flores, quidquid annus adtulit ;
Hybla, florum sume uestem quantus Ennae campus est.
ruris hic erunt puellae, uel puellae montium,
quaeque siluas, quaeque lucos, quaeque fontes incolunt.
iussit omnes adsidere pueri mater alitis,
iussit et nudo puellas nil amori credere.
cras amet qui nunquam amauit, quique amauit cras amet.
cras erit quom primus aether copulauit nuptias :
ut pater totis crearet uernus annum nubibus,
in sinum maritus imber fluxit almae coniugis.
unde fetus mixtus omnis aleret magno corpore.
ipsa uenas atque mentem permeanti spiritu
intus occultis gubernat procreatrix uiribus
perque caelum, perque terras, perque pontum subditum
peruium sui tenorem seminali tramite
inbuit, iussitque mundum nosse nascendi uias.
cras amet qui nunquam amauit, quique amauit cras amet.

grove: a boy goes with the girls: yet Love surely cannot be on holiday when he is carrying his arrows. Go, nymphs, he has dropped his arms: Love is on holiday: he is bidden to go unarmed and bare, so that he may do no injury with bow or arrow or torch. Yet be careful, nymphs, for Love is fair; and Love is fully armed when Love is bare.

To-morrow love comes to the loveless, to-morrow lovers love again.

Venus sends you virgins as modest: one thing we ask, maid of Delos: let the wood be unstained by the blood of wild creatures, and have green shadows and fresh flowers. She herself would ask you, if one so chaste would listen: she herself would have you join us, if a virgin might. For three nights of holiday you should see the dancers and their fellows pass through your woods, among wreathed flowers and myrtle arbours, with wine and bread and poetry. All night must we watch and sing: let Venus reign in the woods: Diana, go.

To-morrow love comes to the loveless, to-morrow lovers love again.

The goddess has ordered her court to be heaped with Hybla's flowers: she herself will preside and give judgment and by her side will be the graces. Hybla, pour out all the flowers the year has brought: wear a garment of flowers as wide as the fields of Enna. Here will come country maidens, and maidens of the mountains: and those from woods and groves and springs. She has ordered all to come, the mother of the winged boy: she has ordered no girl to trust even in naked Love.

To-morrow love comes to the loveless, to-morrow lovers love again.

To-morrow is the day when primeval Ether married: to create the year's fruits from clouds he fell in spring as rain on to the bosom of his gentle wife, Earth, and mingled in her great body gives food to all that lives. She herself the procreatress, controls veins and mind by a spirit running

ipsa Troianos nepotes in Latinos transtulit,
ipsa Laurentem puellam coniugem nato dedit,
moxque Marti de sacello dat pudicam uirginem,
Romuleas ipsa fecit cum Sabinis nuptias,
unde Ramnes et Quirites, proque prole posterum
Romuli parem creauit et nepotem Caesarem.
cras amet qui nunquam amauit, quique amauit cras amet.
rura fecundat uoluptas, rura Venerem sentiunt,
ipse amor, puer Dionae, rure natus dicitur :
hunc, ager cum parturiret, ipsa suscepit sinu,
ipsa florum delicatis educauit osculis.
cras amet qui nunquam amauit, quique amauit cras amet.
ecce, iam super genestas explicant tauri latus,
quisque tutus quo tenetur coniugali foedere,
subter umbras cum maritis, ecce, balantum greges,
et canoras non tacere diua iussit alites.
iam loquaces ore rauco stagna cygni perstrepunt,
adsonat Terei puella, subter umbram populi,
ut putes motus amoris ore dici musico,
et neges queri sororem de marito barbaro.
cras amet qui nunquam amauit, quique amauit cras amet.
illa cantat : nos tacemus. quando uer uenit meum ?
quando fiam uti chelidon, ut tacere desinam ?
perdidi musam tacendo, nec me Apollo respicit.
[sic Amyclas, cum taceret, perdidit silentium]
cras amet qui nunquam amauit quique amauit cras amet.

*

EXPLICIT

* PERVIGILIVM *

VENERIS

*

through within, with hidden strength: through sky and land and the sea below she has made the passage of herself through all things, on her life-giving course, and shown to the world the secret of birth.

To-morrow love comes to the loveless, to-morrow lovers love again.

She herself brought to Italy her Trojan offspring, herself married the Laurentine princess to her son, and gave a sworn virgin from the chapel to Mars: herself made the Roman marriage with the Sabines, the source of all the Roman nation, and for posterity of their posterity she created Caesar, the descendant and equal of Romulus.

To-morrow love comes to the loveless, to-morrow lovers love again.

The fields quicken with joy, the fields feel Venus' power, Love himself, her child, they say was born in the fields: when the meadow was flowering she held him to her bosom, she fed him on the soft kisses of flowers.

To-morrow love comes to the loveless, to-morrow lovers love again.

See, the bulls stretch out their flanks upon the broom, each safe and bound to his mates, the sheep bleat beneath the shade, ram and ewes, the birds are singing as the goddess has ordered, and the harsh voices of the swans ring over the pools. The nightingale sings from the shadow of a poplar, and you would think her music was a love-song and not a sister's complaint of her savage husband.

To-morrow love comes to the loveless, to-morrow lovers love again.

She is singing, we are dumb. When will spring come to me? When shall I become like a swallow and cease my silence? I have lost the muse by silence, and the god does not heed me.

To-morrow love comes to the loveless, to-morrow lovers love again.

* THE END *

COMMENTARY

COMMENTARY

IT WOULD not be possible to discuss here the various re-arrangements of the *Peruigilium* attempted by scholars. Mr. Clementi in his *Studies in the Peruigilium* (1913) gave five re-arrangements in tabular form, which were all intended to restore to the poem a strophic structure. They none of them agreed in any but the most trifling particulars. (His own re-arrangement was the simplest and probably the least violent). Dr. Mackail cut up and re-arranged the poem into quatrains, and wrote in verses of his own to fill out the poem where his scheme required it. Since then, Mr. Fort has added a new scheme, postulating a written and a sung version of the poem—also with insertions. To this list Mr. Clementi added a further table of eleven more re-arrangements which were not based on a strophic plan, and he could have increased that number.

These alterations, some of which are really astounding, are based on two assumptions: firstly, that the refrain cannot occur at irregular intervals, but that a plan or scheme must be hidden; secondly, that the MSS. are in a very corrupt condition and there are difficulties that show that large transpositions have occurred.

The first assumption has never been proved, and is probably not provable. Against it are the facts, firstly, that according to the MSS. the refrain *does* occur at irregular intervals; secondly, that seventeen different attempts at least have been made to "re-introduce order" into the poem, and they none of them agree at all. It may be that the poem had originally a strophic or quatrain construction, but scholars have not succeeded in discovering what it was, or agreeing upon it. It is true enough, as Mr. Clementi and Dr. Mackail argue, that after they have made certain of their changes the "outline of a structure begins to appear." He would indeed be a clever poet who could write a poem such that no determined editor could, by

reckless transposition, force a rhythmic character on it. Until a convincing re-arrangement is brought forward, it is wisest to hold as near as is reasonably possible to the manuscript arrangement, and admit that the refrain may have occurred at irregular intervals in a poem which is half-way between ancient verse with its strophae and mediæval hymns with their quatrains.

Now, as to the manuscript text. Are the MSS. very corrupt, and are large transpositions necessary? A formidable list of apparent errors is given in the list below, which I have endeavoured to make as full as possible. But really there are few evidences of deep corruption. If the erratic spelling of the two manuscripts (Codex Salmasianus, "S," and Codex Thuaneus, "T") is reduced to any accepted standard, a good half of the errors disappear. There are also one or two obvious blunders, for the copyists were in both cases singularly illiterate. Omitting such blunders and mispellings, there are only twelve lines, in this supposedly grossly corrupt poem of ninety-three lines, where the MS. reading demands alteration. It is not to be denied that the present condition of both MSS. is, on the face of it, unsatisfying, but that the manuscripts (or manuscript, as is likely) from which they were copied, was seriously damaged, is by no means proved. There is indeed only one line (22) where I suspect deep corruption: apart from this, the lines of the poem make good sense with a minimum of alteration.

If we consider their *order* (so far as the two questions can be considered separately) a similar observation is true. One transposition has certainly occurred: line 58 should follow line 39. Where one transposition has occurred, others, of course, may have. But that does not give us free licence to move lines about at our pleasure unless, independently of any *a priori* strophic theory, the sense of the poem requires it. Nor is it sufficient to argue—as the gentlemen did who wrote the notes I quote on line 90—

that the poem is artistically improved by such alterations. We must be convinced that the changes restore what the poet wrote, not what he ought to have written. Richard Bentley, in editing *Paradise Lost*, made vast improvements, as he thought, by such methods, but the great doctor's edition of Milton is generally held out as an example to be feared rather than imitated.

It is not possible to deal with all the transpositions which have been made. Two of the most frequent require mention. Lines 73—74 and 71—72 were transposed by Bährens. They also require emendation, and, emended, give sense as they stand. Transposed simply, they do not appear to me to give very good sense. The question is one which any reader can answer according to his own taste.

More serious is the question of line 9, in which it is argued that the word *tunc* has no meaning. The suggestion by Mr. Owen that it refers to *uer* in lines 1—2 has been rejected on the ground that the distance is too great between the lines. It is also argued that it is odd that the author in a poem of 93 lines should "postpone till line 59 his explanation of why the coming day will be so high a festival" (Clementi). Hence it has been a common practice to transfer to this place some or all of the passage beginning *cras erit quom primus Aether* (line 59). Once this beginning has been made the floodgates are open, and the editors go right on to rearrange the poem in a strophic and often catastrophic manner. All this depends on the assumption that *tunc* has no meaning. This hardly seems just. *Tunc*, I wish to submit, has precisely its proper meaning: "at that point of time, on that date." *Tunc* is not *tum*. It refers, as is natural, to *cras* in the line before. It offers the explanation why to-morrow will be "so high a festival." The three lines mean, briefly, "To-morrow was Venus' birthday." It is no odder that *fecit* should follow *tunc* when it refers to *cras* than that *copulauit*, also in the perfect tense, should follow *cras erit quom* in line 59.

I append a list of readings. Wherever either or both of MSS. differ from the text I have given the variant, even if it is only an obvious misspelling. I have also given an arbitrary selection of the more interesting conjectures. *Pithoeus* is Pithou, who published the *editio princeps*. Dousa is the younger Dousa, who palmed off for fifty years an indecent fragment of a fake *Peruigilium* on the world. S is the Codex Salmasianus, T the Codex Thuaneus. Both these MSS. are in the Paris Librairie Nationale.

HEADING *from* S *only*

(1) S amabit quique amauit : T amauit quique cras amauit amet.
(2) S uere natus Iouis : T uer natus orbis.
(3) T nubent.
(4) T resoluet.
(5) T amorem.
(6) S gaza uirentis . . . mirteo : T gazas uirentes . . . myrteo : *Pithoeus* casas.
(7) S fultas sublime trono.
(8) T quinque.
(9) S superbo : T tuno quiuore de superhuc spumeo pont' de glouo.
(10) ST cerulas : T uipedes.
(11) de maritis imbribus *is probably a mistake from line* 3 : *Riuinus read* marinis *which is lame*.
(13) T gemmas : ST floribus : *Rigler* floridis.
(14) T surgentes . . . sparitu (*altered to* spuritu) : ST faboni.
(15) S notos penates ipsas : T totos pentes ipsa : *Scriuerius* nodos : *Lipsius* tepentes : *Bährens* feraces.
(16) T relinquid : ST tumentis : *Pithoeus* umentes.
(17) S et micanat lacrimas : T et mecanat lacrime . . cadū : *Lipsius* en micant : *Salmasius* emicant.
(18) S urbe . . . sustine : T preceps orbe . . . sustinet.

(19) S in pudore florulente . . . purpore : T in pudorem florulente . . . purpure : *Schultze* en.
(20) S humor : T umor.
(21) S tumenti : T papilla.
(22) S manet tute : T ip . . . mane tuae : *Dousa* ut udae : *Orelli* totae (" *all*") : *Mackail* nudae, *expanding the line into two. The line presents two further difficulties* (1) " iussit " *is used elsewhere in the poem but with its normal construction* (2) " ipsa . . . facta " *appear to refer to the same person, whereas, of course, the second line refers to the rose. The corruption lies probably very deep. Cf. note on line* 63.
(23) S facta prius : T fusta prius . . . decque : *Conjectures are :* facta Cypridis, Veneris, Paphies, de ipsius.
(24) S purporis.
(26) S unica marita noto : T unica marito nodo . . . pudent : *Bergk* uoto (" marriage ") : *Bucheler* unico Noto marita.
(28) ST nimfas : T loco.
(29) ST et : T comis : *Pithoeus* it.
(31) S in te nimfe : T ite nymfe.
(32) S iussus e . . . nudos : T est . . . durus.
(33) T quid acuneo . . . quid digne : ST lederet.
(35) S inermis sidem : T inermis idem : *Pithoeus* in armis : *Scrieruius* est in armis totus (*for metrical reasons but the trochaic metre had a strong accentual element*).
(36) S amit : T qui amauit.
(37) S unam res : T una re.
(39) S tragibus.
(40) T *omits altogether :* S uellit erogare.
(41) S uellit.
(42) feriantes *and* feriatos *have been conjectured.*
(44) S myrteo.
(45) S baccus : T baccas . . . deas.
(46) S detinente . . . peruiclanda : T detinent et. *Mackail*

de tenente (" *unceasingly* ") . . . perviglanda : *Clementi, after Owen* detinenda est tota noctis pervigilia canticis (pervigilia *fem. sing.* " *vigil* ").

(49) S hyblei : T ybleis.

(50) S presens . . . dicit adsederunt : *Dousa* praeses . . . dicet, adsidebunt.

(51) S hibla totus fundet quidquid annos adtullit : T annis.

(52) ST hibla : S superestem : T rumpereste : *Crusius* sume uestem : S etnec : T ethne, Enna *is a common variant for* Aetna, *which is not remarkable for flowers : cf. Ovid, Met. V* 385, *Columella X* 270, *Sil. Ital. I* 93 etc.

(53) T t *for* uel.

(54) S quae locus : T quaeque locos : ST montes : *Scriuerius* fontes.

(55) T alitas : *Bucheler* mater alitis dei.

(56) T nullo.

(58) ST rigentibus : S uirentes duoad umbra : T uirgentes ducat umbras : *the anonymous Leipzig edition* (1852) *transferred this line to its correct place, after line* 39.

(59) S quo (*for* quom) : T qui : S ether copolauit niptias.

(60) S creauit : ST uernis : *Pithoeus* uernus.

(61) S alme : T fluctus almae et.

(62) S flaetus . . . omnis alteret : T ut fletus . . . aleret

(63) T uernas : S adque : T permeante spū. *Notice that* ipsa *here as always in this poem is the goddess, the mistress of the festival* (suamque norat ipsam), *being almost a proper name. It is easily understood and should not be used as an excuse for shifting the passage elsewhere on the ground that it refers to* coniugis. *The passage must remain here because of the sense, which is : " Earth and Ether made all living bodies, but Venus controls them."*

(64) S gobernat procreatis.

(65) S per quem . . . per quem.

(66) S tenderem.

(67) T nosce.
(69) T nec potes . . . latino.
(72) S romuleas ipsas : T rumuleas ipsa . . . Saumis
(73) S samnes T ramnes.
(74) ST romoli matrem crearet : *Bucheler* Romulum patrem : *Fort* Romuli parem creauit.
(76) T facundat.
(77) ST dione : S natu.
(78) T perturirit : S sinum.
(79) S deligatis.
(80) T amat *for second* amauit.
(81) ST aonii : *Pithoeus* tauri.
(82) S tutus quo tenetur coniugali federe : T tuus . . . cum iugali : *Mackail* coetus continetur.
(83) S gregis : T ualantum gregum.
(84) S canores.
(85) T cigni : S ſtangna quinni.
(86) S popoli : T adsonante aerei puelle supter.
(87) S mussico : T putas.
(88) S queris : T eet.
(88A) *Refrain inserted by Clementi (and others, following Riuinus) in pursuance of his ſtrophic arrangement. I have retained it because the whole ſtructure of the poem demands a break of some kind here.*
(89) S quan : ST uir.
(90) S fiam ut : T faciam ut . . . taceret : ST celidon : *Riuinus suggeſted* " uti chelidon," *but he preferred* " quando fies muta, aedon, ut tacente te canam," *meaning,* "When will you be silent and let me have my turn?" *Wernsdorf believed, on the ſtrength of an inscription, that Chelidon was the name of the poet's wife and the line meant,* " When shall I talk as much as my wife ? "
(91) T perdidimus antacendonē : ST foebus : *Thomasius* Apollo.

(92) S amiclas . . . perdedit : T amidas . . . perdidit : ST taceret : *emendations* tacebant, tacerent. *I have bracketed this line and struck it out of the translation : this is the only liberty that I have permitted myself upon my own unsupported judgment. It was, indeed, the annoyance of seeing this wretched interpolation at the magnificent end of a magnificent poem, turning up unchallenged in every edition that made me decide to offer this edition. Consider the position of the line in the whole poem and its relevance. The writer of this " leaf lost from the closing manuscript of Roman poetry " has been dwelling upon the new life that is rising all around him, because spring has come. But the song of the nightingale, happy and not sorrowful though it is, makes him break off and remember that for him there is no spring : the utter neglect of art and beauty has brought its natural consequences : the " divine afflatus," as it would once have been called in English, has gone.*

Perdidi musam tacendo, nec me Apollo respicit. *So the poem ends on a note of sadness, as, indeed, it should. For this is the last of the Roman singers : it is not, it is true, of the barbarians from over the frontier that he is thinking, but of a sister symptom of decay, the dead artificiality of the art and poetry of his day. Then, to this perfect ending somebody has added the fatuous comment, "So Amyclae, when it was silent, was destroyed by silence." Whoever wrote in the margin his* " Sic Amyclas perdidit silentium," *to show that he had read Virgil Aen. X 564, was not an inspired commentator, but the introduction of the redundant, ungrammatical, and prosaic* " cum taceret " *to make the line scan, has made his inappositeness worse. And what has Amyclae to do with it, anyway? According to the scholars, there were two Amyclae, one in Laconia, one in Italy. The story about silence is obscure, and it is not certain to which town it belongs. But it appears to have been a variant of the " crying Wolf ! Wolf ! " story. What relevance an allusion of such a kind has here is more*

than any scholar, so far as I can find, has attempted to say.

Finally, and this is important, Mr. Fort, in his edition dated 1922, *has pointed out that the "Peruigilium" excludes—with this exception—all words longer than three syllables at the end of the line. Where this rule is not observed, as he proves from examples, the introduction of quadrisyllables and longer words makes a startling change in the quality and music of the verse. He himself retains this verse, because he requires it for an elaborate reconstruction of the poem, but unless we accept his quatrain arrangement there is no need to retain it.*

(94) Explicit, etc., *given only in* T.

PRINTED AT THE PELICAN PRESS
2 CARMELITE STREET, LONDON, ENGLAND

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 9999 10030 661 0